

**From:** [Jay Field](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [rgensemer@parametrix.com](#); [Robert Neely](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Bioassay Interpretation at Portland Harbor  
**Date:** 06/08/2009 12:25 PM  
**Attachments:** [PH\\_ToxRef\\_090608.xls](#)

---

Eric,  
attached is a file including control-adjusted values, significance, and  
tox level classification for the samples. As I mentioned previously, I  
did not take statistical significance into account. one sample with  
maximum tox level classification of 2 is affected (ie, samples that  
classify as level 2 for the endpoint but are not statistically  
significant and no other endpoint would classify >= 2). there are a  
number of such samples for tox level = 1. If those samples are an  
issue, we should ask LWG for a determination of statistical power (for  
Round 2, LWG classified samples as not significant, significant, or  
indeterminate).  
Jay

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> I agree. The message I left with John this morning was to figure out  
> what information we should exchange (us to them, them to us) to  
> facilitate this discussion. Can you could start to pull together a  
> similar package for the LWG?

> Thanks, Eric

>  
>  
> Jay Field  
> <Jay.Field@noaa.  
> gov>

> 06/08/2009 11:03  
> AM

To  
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc  
Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
rgensemer@parametrix.com, Joe  
Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip  
Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject  
Re: Bioassay Interpretation at  
Portland Harbor

>  
>  
> Eric,  
> before we talk with John, I think we should request a table from LWG  
> with raw values, control-adjusted values, significance, and tox level  
> classification. Without knowing what the discrepancies are, I'm not  
> sure what we would accomplish by having a discussion. Also, I would  
> like some more clarification on item #3, calculation of hit level. We  
> used the reference envelope value (REV) and 90%, 80%, and 70% of that  
> value to determine the thresholds. (all values are control-adjusted  
> values). this is the same as subtracting 10% of the REV from the REV,  
> but avoids potential compounding rounding errors.

> I'm available most of this week except Thursday.

> Jay

> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

>  
> At the AOPC meeting, it became apparent that our interpretation of  
> the sediment bioassay results did not match the LWG's  
> interpretation. I am interested in understanding the basis for  
> this discrepancy. Based on my review of the data, the bioassay  
> results match up with the bins that we established in Table RE-2  
> in our March 31, 2009 direction to LWG (see previous email). Last  
> week, I put in a call to John Toll to try to understand the LWG's  
> interpretation. Although I did not speak directly with John, he  
> left me a voice mail that described 3 possibilities for the  
> discrepancy:

>  
> 1) The raw response rates differ slightly - e.g., 15% vs. 17%.  
> John does not know why this is the case.  
> 2) Significance Testing. The LWG used the biostats software. He  
> indicated that this is a complicated procedure but that the LWG  
> followed the decision tree associated with the software package  
> and did not make any choices that were inconsistent with the  
> decision tree.  
> 3) The calculation of the level of the hit (e.g., low, moderate  
> or severe toxicity) based on a comparison to the reference  
> envelope was based on an added 10% to the reference envelop  
> opposed to multiplying by the reference envelope value by 1.1 or  
> 1.2.

>  
>  
> I would like to set up a time to discuss this sometime this week.  
> Please let me know when you might be available. I will work with  
> John to hopefully have some information that we can use to focus  
> the discussion.

>  
> Thanks, Eric,  
>  
>

> --  
> Jay Field  
> Assessment and Restoration Division  
> Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA  
> 7600 Sand Point Way NE  
> Seattle, WA 98115-6349  
> (P) 206-526-6404  
> (F) 206-526-6865  
> (E) jay.field@noaa.gov  
>  
>  
>

--  
Jay Field  
Assessment and Restoration Division  
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA  
7600 Sand Point Way NE  
Seattle, WA 98115-6349  
(P) 206-526-6404  
(F) 206-526-6865  
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov